



Soil Erosion

Sheet and Rill Erosion

Planning Criteria	Planning Cr	riteria Met
Screening level: Permanent ground cover $> 90\%$ and slope $< 10\%$. Assessment level: The water erosion rate is $<=$ T.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation	Test Met
All temporary or permanent rills and gullies are stabilized. All areas expected to have high erosion rates are stable.	Yes	No 🗌
All non-traffic areas are vegetated.	Yes	No 🗌
Wind Erosion		
Planning Criteria	Planning Cr	riteria Met
Screening level: Permanent ground cover $>$ 90% and slope $<$ 10%. Assessment level: The wind erosion rate is $<=$ T.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation 7	Test Met
All non-traffic areas are vegetated.	Yes	No 🗌
All temporary or permanent rills and gullies are stabilized. All areas expected to have high erosion rates are stable.	Yes	No





Classic Gully Erosion

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Screening level: Classic gullies are not present. Assessment level: Classic gully management is adequate to stop the progression of head cutting and widening and are offsite impacts are minimized by vegetation and/or structures.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	All temporary or permanent rills and gullies are stabilized. All areas expected to have high erosion rates are stable.	Yes	No 🗌
	Soil erosion in areas integrated with trees is controlled. There are no impacts on sensitive vegetation. There are no occurrences or enlargement of gullies.	Yes	No
St	reambank, Shoreline, Water Conveyance Channels		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Screening level: Streams, shoreline or channels are not adjacent to site. Assessment level: For shorelines and water conveyance channels; banks are stable or commensurate with normal geomorphological processes, AND if bank erosion is present, it is beyond the client's control or commensurate with normal geomorphological processes, AND for streambanks, SVAP2 bank condition element score > 5.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	Excluding all fundamentally unstable, natural geomorphic streambanks/shorelines, all streambanks/shorelines on the operation show few signs of erosion or bank failure. Each is stable and protected with natural materials.	Yes	No





Water Quality Degradation

Nutrients in Surface Water

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	eria Met
	Screening level: Organic or inorganic nutrients are not applied AND the PLU is not grazed AND there are no confined livestock areas. Assessment level: Nutrients if applied, are based on a soil test, tissue tests or nutrient budget AND conservation practices and managements are in place to minimize surface water impacts.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	The land adjacent to a stream, river, or other waterbody on the side or sides you control does: - have diverse, natural plant cover typical to that along streams in your area, - extend from the stream bank/shoreline for a distance of 35 feet or (if applicable) the minimum State buffer-width requirement, whichever is greater, AND - have few places where concentrated runoff flows through.	Yes	No
	Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas.	Yes	No 🗌
	ccess Pathogens and Chemicals from Manure, Bio-solids or	· Compost A	<u>oplications</u>
<u>in</u>	Surface Water		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	eria Met
	Screening level: Potential sources of pathogens or pharmaceuticals are not applied on the land. Assessment level: Organic materials are applied, stored, and/or handled to mitigate negative impacts to surface water sources.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas.	Yes	No





Petroleum, Heavy Metal and Other Pollutants Transported to Surface Water

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	eria Met
	Screening level: Activities do not present the potential for contamination by petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants. Assessment level: Petroleum, heavy metals or other potential pollutants are stored and handled to avoid runoff to surface water.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	est Met
	The fuel storage area and tank is located: - above the 100-year floodplain, - a minimum of 100 feet from any river, stream, ditch, pond, lake, sinkhole, wetland, or water well, and - within a stable place designed to provide secondary containment if the primary means were to fail.	Yes	No
<u>Pe</u>	troleum, Heavy Metal and Other Pollutants Transported t	o Ground W	ater_
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	eria Met
	Screening level: Activities do not present the potential for contamination by petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants. Assessment level: Petroleum, heavy metals or other potential pollutants are stored and handled to avoid runoff to groundwater.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	est Met
	The fuel storage area and tank is located: - above the 100-year floodplain, - a minimum of 100 feet from any river, stream, ditch, pond, lake, sinkhole, wetland, or water well, and - within a stable place designed to provide secondary containment if the primary means were to fail.	Yes	No





Excessive Sediment in Surface Water

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	eria Met
	Screening level: Permanent ground cover $>$ 90% and slope $<$ 10% AND classic gullies are not present AND streams or shoreline are not on or adjacent to site. Assessment level: Upslope treatment and buffer practices address concentrated flows to water bodies AND the SVAP2 - bank condition $>=$ 5 AND the livestock and vehicle water crossings are stable AND The water erosion rate is $<=$ T AND wind erosion rate is $<=$ T.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	The land adjacent to a stream, river, or other waterbody on the side or sides you control does: - have diverse, natural plant cover typical to that along streams in your area, - extend from the stream bank/shoreline for a distance of 35 feet or (if applicable) the minimum State buffer-width requirement, whichever is greater, AND - have few places where concentrated runoff flows through.	Yes	No
	Established filter strips are at least 30 feet wide and maintained.	Yes	No 🗌
	All temporary or permanent rills and gullies are stabilized. All areas expected to have high erosion rates are stable.	Yes	No
Ele	evated Water Temperature		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	eria Met
	Screening level: Water courses on or adjacent to the site are not designated by a State Agency as a temperature impairment OR water course temperature is not a client concern. Assessment level: The SVAP2 - riparian area quality element score is >= 5 AND the SVAP2 - riparian area quantity quality element score is >= 5 AND the SVAP2 - canopy cover element score is >= 6, OR existing conservation practices are in place to address water temperature.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	More than 50 percent of the water surface is shaded on the length of the stream/river you control.	Yes	No





Air Quality Impacts

Emissions of Particulate Matter (PM) and PM Precursors

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	eria Met
	Screening level: Activities are not present that contribute to agricultural source PM or PM precursor emissions AND episodes or complaints of emissions of PM (dust, smoke, exhaust, etc.), or chemical drift have not occurred. PM producing activity examples are: Prescribed Burn is conducted, Travel ways unpaved or treated with binding agents, Engines (combustion source), Tillage, Pesticides are applied, Fertilization (manure/ commercial), CAFO/manure management). Assessment level: PM and PM Precursor emmissions are managed to meet client objectives.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	est Met
	Dust is controlled on all non-vegetated, unpaved travel ways.	Yes	No 🗌
<u>E</u> 1	missions of Ozone Precursors		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	eria Met
	Screening level: Operations are not present that produce ozone precursor emissions. Ozone precursor producing activities are: Engines (combustion source), Pesticide application, Burning, CAFO/manure management, Fertilization (manure/commercial). Assessment level: Ozone precursor emmissions are managed to meet client objectives.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	est Met
	Energy-efficient vehicles, equipment, and actions are used to lessen discharges of NOx and SOx. For example, using the minimum level of equipment needed to accomplish the activity, minimizing number of trips into the forest, and leaving woody residue in place if not a fire or pest hazard.	Yes	No





Emission of Greenhouse Gases (GHGs)

Planning Criteria	Planning Ci	riteria Met
Screening level: Activities are not present that produce GHGs emissions. GHG producing activities are: Fertilization(manure/commercial), CAFO/manure management, Engines (combustion source), Tillage, AND GHGs are not regulated in this planning area. Assessment level: Greenhouse gas emmissions are managed to meet client objectives.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation '	Test Met
Energy-efficient vehicles, equipment, and actions are used to lessen discharges of NOx and SOx. For example, using the minimum level of equipment needed to accomplish the activity, minimizing number of trips into the forest, and leaving woody residue in place if not a fire or pest hazard.	Yes	No





Degraded Plant Condition

Inadequate Structure and Composition

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	eria Met
	Screening level: Plant communities support the intended land use and desired ecological functions. Assessment level: Plant communities contain adequate diversity, composition and structure to support desired ecological functions.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	est Met
	The current plants provide the desired habitat structure and composition.	Yes	No 🗌
Exe	cessive Plant Pest Pressure		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crit	eria Met
	Screening level: Plant productivity is not limited from pest pressure. Assessment level: Pest damage to plants are below economic or environmental thresholds or client-identified criteria AND plant pests, including noxious and invasive species are managed to meet client objectives.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	est Met
	Invasive and noxious weeds are controlled or not present.	Yes	No 🗌





Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat

Inadequate Habitat - Food

Planning Criteria	Planning Criteria Met	•
Assessment level: The WHSI rating is >= 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is >= 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is >= 7, OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR food is available in quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.	Yes No]
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Test Met	
The land adjacent to a stream, river, or other waterbody on the side or sides you control does: - have diverse, natural plant cover typical to that along streams in your area, AND - extend from the stream bank/shoreline for a distance of 35 feet or (if applicable) the minimum State buffer-width requirement, whichever is greater.	Yes No]
State burier-within requirement, whichever is greater.		





Inadequate Habitat - Cover/Shelter

Planning Criteria	Planning C	riteria Met
Assessment level: The WHSI rating is >= 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is >= 7 AND the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is >= 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is >= 7, OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR cover is of available quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.	Yes	No
Evaluation Tests	Evaluation	Test Met
Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas	Yes	No
The pond/lake, which supports a natural or planted fish population, is managed: -to exclude livestock, -to control nuisance species and undesirable aquatic vegetation controlled, -to complies with state and local regulations when stocking the pond, AND -use of a buffer zone of diverse, natural plant cover at least 35 feet wide.	Yes	No
The stream(s) have: - a natural, unaltered configuration, with minimal channel straightening, dredging, or bank alteration by armoring with rip-rap or other non-natural materials, - stable banks with limited erosion or bank failure, and - human uses and/or grazing levels that do not negatively impact bank condition.	Yes	No





Inadequate Habitat - Water

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Assessment level: The WHSI rating is $>= 0.5$ AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is $>= 7$, OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR water is available in quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	Access to water is at the right height, depth and time of year for wildlife species.	Yes	No
	Changes to water flow for irrigation or otherwise are limited to not alter the stream's usual flow.	Yes	No 🗌
<u>In</u>	adequate Habitat - Habitat Continuity (Space)		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Assessment level: The WHSI rating is >= 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is >= 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is >= 7, OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR The connectivity of habitat components are adequate to support stable populations of targeted species.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	In-stream structures (dam, diversion structure, bridge, culvert, low-water stream crossing, etc.) allow for the upstream/downstream movement of fish and other aquatic animals throughout most of the year.	Yes	No
	People, vehicles, equipment, or livestock are only moved across a stream/river at a bridge, culvert, or stabilized ford crossing(s). Travel across the stream/river beyond these crossings is controlled.	Yes	No





Livestock Production Limitation

Inadequate Feed and Forage

	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifer, livestock forage, roughage and supplemental nutritional requirements addressed.	Yes	No 🗌
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	The existing feed/forage quantity/quality meet the livestock needs and goals.	Yes	No 🗌
<u>In</u>	adequate Shelter		
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifer, artificial or natural shelters meet animal health needs and client objectives.	Yes	No 🗌
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Te	st Met
	Evaluation Tests Livestock has adequate shelter.	Yes	st Met No
<u>In</u>			
<u>In</u>	Livestock has adequate shelter.		No
<u>In</u>	Livestock has adequate shelter. adequate Water	Yes	No
<u>In</u>	Livestock has adequate shelter. adequate Water Planning Criteria Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifer, water of acceptable quality and quantity adequately distributed to meet animal	Yes Planning Crite	No eria Met





Inefficient Energy Use

Equipment and Facilities

	Planning Criteria	Planning Criteria Met	
	Screening level: Client is not interested in improving equipment and facilities energy efficiency. Assessment level: Major components of a USDA approved energy audit have been implemented that address equipment and facilities to meet client objectives OR On-farm renewable energy and/or energy conserving practices have been implemented to meet client objectives.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Test Met	
	Recommendations/components of an energy audit have been applied. The audit addressed equipment and facilities on the farm. For example, energy loss from lighting, drying, refrigeration, heating, or building insulation have been improved.	Yes	No
Farming/Ranching Practices and Field Operations			
	Planning Criteria	Planning Crite	eria Met
	Screening level: Client is not interested in improving equipment and facilities energy efficiency. Assessment level: Major components of a USDA approved energy audit have been implemented that address equipment and facilities to meet client objectives OR On-farm renewable energy and/or energy conserving practices have been implemented to meet client objectives.	Yes	No
	Evaluation Tests	Evaluation Test Met	
	Recommendations/components of an energy audit have been applied. The audit addressed equipment and facilities on the farm. For example, energy loss from lighting, drying, refrigeration, heating, or building insulation have been improved.	Yes	No